arXiv:1403.7354v1 [math.PR] 28 Mar 2014

EXTREMES OF ORDER STATISTICS OF STATIONARY PROCESSES

KRZYSZTOF DĘBICKI, ENKELEJD HASHORVA, LANPENG JI, AND CHENGXIU LING

Abstract: Let $\{X_i(t), t \geq 0\}, 1 \leq i \leq n$ be independent copies of a stationary process $\{X(t), t \geq 0\}$. For given positive constants u, T, define the set of rth conjunctions $C_{r,T,u} := \{t \in [0,T] : X_{r:n}(t) > u\}$ with $X_{r:n}(t)$ the rth largest order statistics of $X_1(t), \ldots, X_n(t), t \geq 0$. In numerous applications such as brain mapping and digital communication systems, of interest is the approximation of the probability that the set of conjunctions $C_{r,T,u}$ is not empty. Imposing the Albin's conditions on X, in this paper we obtain an exact asymptotic expansion of this probability as u tends to infinity. Further, we establish the tail asymptotics of the supremum of a generalized skew-Gaussian process and a Gumbel limit theorem for the minimum order statistics of stationary Gaussian processes. As a by-product we derive a version of Li and Shao's normal comparison lemma for the minimum and the maximum of Gaussian random vectors.

Key Words: conjunction; order statistics process; generalized Albin constant; Albin's conditions; Berman's inequality; skew-Gaussian process; normal comparison lemma.

AMS Classification: Primary 60G15; secondary 60G70

1. Introduction and Main Result

Let $\{X(t), t \geq 0\}$ be a stationary process with almost surely (a.s.) continuous sample paths and denote by $X_1, \ldots, X_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ independent copies of X. The main object of interest in this contribution is the rth order statistics process $X_{r:n}$ of $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, i.e., for any $t \geq 0$

$$X_{n:n}(t) \leq \cdots \leq X_{1:n}(t). \tag{1}$$

Throughout the paper, the process $X_{r:n}$ is called the rth order statistics process generated by the process X. For a given positive threshold u and a fixed constant $T > 0$ define the set of rth conjunction

$$C_{r,T,u} := \{t \in [0,T] : X_{r:n}(t) > u\}$$

and set

$$p_{r,T}(u) := \mathbb{P}\left(C_{r,T,u} \neq \phi\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} X_{r:n}(t) > u\right). \tag{2}$$

Calculation of $p_{r,T}(u)$ plays an important role in various applications, for instance in the analysis of functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) data and the surface roughness during all machinery processes. For smooth

Date: March 31, 2014.

Gaussian random fields approximations of $p_{n,T}(u)$ have been discussed in [6, 13, 28], whereas results for non-Gaussian random fields are derived in [8]. Exact asymptotic expansion of $p_{r,T}(u)$ for the class of stationary Gaussian processes X was recently derived in [14]. Obviously, the Gaussian random field cannot be used to model phenomena and data sets that exhibit certain non-Gaussian characteristics such as skewness. Skewness arises in many applied-oriented fields, such as engineering, medical, agriculture and environmental; see, e.g., [1, 7, 29]. In recent years, new technologies such as fMRI and positron emission tomography have been used to collect data concerning the living human brain as well as astrophysics. As mentioned in the literature, these images can be efficiently modelled by stationary random fields.

Motivated by [14] and the tractability of stationary processes, in this paper, we shall investigate the asymptotic behaviour of $p_{r,T}(u)$, as u tends to infinity.

For the formulation of our main result we need to introduce the Albin's conditions given in [2, 3, 5]. In what follows, let D be a non-empty subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

Condition A(D**)**: (Gumbel MDA and conditional limit distribution) Suppose that $X(0)$ has a continuous df with infinite right endpoint, and it is in the Gumbel max-domain of attraction (MDA), i.e., for some positive measurable scaling function $w(\cdot)$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X(0) > u + \frac{x}{w(u)}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(X(0) > u\right) e^{-x}(1 + o(1)), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \tag{3}$$

as $u \to \infty$. Let $q = q(u)$ be a strictly positive non-increasing function, satisfying $\lim_{u\to\infty} q(u) = 0$. Assume further that, for any $y \in$ D, there exists a random process $\{\xi_y(t), t \geq 0\}$ such that, for any grid of points $0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_d < \infty$ the convergence in distribution (denoted by $\stackrel{d}{\to}$)

$$\Big(w(u)(X(qt_1) - u), \ldots, w(u)(X(qt_d) - u)\Big)\Big|\Big(w(u)(X(0) - u) > y\Big) \stackrel{d}{\to} \Big(\xi_y(t_1), \ldots, \xi_y(t_d)\Big) \tag{4}$$

holds as $u \to \infty$.

Condition B: (Short-lasting-exceedance) For all positive constants a and T

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \limsup_{u\to\infty} \sum_{k=N}^{[T/(aq)]} \mathbb{P}\left(X(aqk) > u | X(0) > u\right) = 0, \tag{5}$$

where $q = q(u)$ is given as in condition A(D) and $[x]$ denotes the integer part of x.

Condition C: Suppose that there exist positive constants λ_0, ρ, b, C and $d > 1$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X(qt) > u + \frac{\lambda}{w(u)}, X(0) \leq u \Big| X(qt) > u\right) \leq Ct^d\lambda^{-b} \tag{6}$$

holds for all u large and all t such that $0 < t^\rho < \lambda < \lambda_0$.

Here we have chosen a simpler condition C than that in [2, 3]. It has been shown in [5] that condition C above is sufficient for the validity of condition C given in [2, 3]; see also Proposition 2 in [4].

Note that the Albin's conditions A(D),B,C given above are satisfied by many well-known stationary processes; see, e.g., [2, 5, 9]. However, showing the validity of these conditions requires in general significant efforts.

Let $\xi_0^{(i)}, i \le n$ be n independent copies of ξ_0 given in condition A($\{0\}$). In order to derive the exact asymptotics of $p_{r,T}(u)$ we introduce the following constants

$$\mathcal{A}_r := \lim_{a\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{a} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{k\ge 1} \min_{1\le i\le r} \xi_0^{(i)}(ak) \le 0 \right), \quad r \le n, \tag{7}$$

which we refer to as the *generalized Albin constants*. Next we state our principle result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\{X_{r:n}(t), t \ge 0\}$ be the rth order statistics process generated by the stationary process X. Suppose that A($\{0\}$), B and C hold for X. Then, for any $T > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} X_{r:n}(t) > u \right) = T\mathcal{A}_r \frac{n!}{r!(n-r)!} \frac{\left(\mathbb{P}\left(X(0) > u\right)\right)^r}{q(u)} (1 + o(1)), \quad u \to \infty, \tag{8}$$

where the generalized Albin constant $\mathcal{A}_r$ defined in (7) *is finite and positive.*

This paper is organised as follows: In Section 2 we discuss an application of Theorem 1.1 concerning the generalized skew-Gaussian processes and then derive the Gumbel limit theorem for the minimum order statistics process generated by a stationary Gaussian process X. All the proofs are presented in Section 3 followed by an Appendix which establishes a version of the Berman's inequality for the minimum and maximum order statistics of Gaussian random vectors. Our result is based on Li and Shao's seminal paper [21], and we refer to it also as the Li and Shao's normal comparison lemma.

2. Skew-Gaussian Processes and the Gumbel Limit Theorem

Throughout this section we assume that $\{X(t), t \ge 0\}$ is a centered stationary Gaussian process with a.s. continuous sample paths and covariance function $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfying

$$\rho(t) < 1, \ \forall t > 0 \ \text{ and } \ \rho(t) = 1 - |t|^\alpha + o(|t|^\alpha), \ t \to 0 \quad \text{for some } \alpha \in (0, 2]. \tag{9}$$

It is known (e.g., [3, 24, 15]) that the process X satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 with the process ξ_0 in condition A($\{0\}$) given by

$$\xi_0(t) = \sqrt{2}Z(t) - t^\alpha + E, \quad t \ge 0, \tag{10}$$

where E is a unit exponential random variable (rv) and $\{Z(t), t \ge 0\}$ is a (independent of E) standard fractional Brownian motion (fBm) with Hurst index $\alpha/2 \in (0, 1]$, i.e., Z is a centered Gaussian process with a.s. continuous sample paths and covariance function

$$\mathbf{Cov}(Z(s), Z(t)) = \frac{1}{2}\Big(s^\alpha + t^\alpha - |s - t|^\alpha\Big), \quad s, t \ge 0.$$

We note in passing that the findings of Theorem 1.1 for such X coincide with those of Theorem 2.2 in [14].

Our setup here is however more general than that of the aforementioned paper, as we demonstrate now. Let $\{X_i(t), t \geq 0\}, i \leq m+1, m \in \mathbb{N}$ be $m+1$ independent copies of the centered stationary Gaussian process X. For any $\delta \in [0,1]$, define the generalized *skew-Gaussian* process $\zeta_{m,\delta}$ as

$$\zeta_{m,\delta}(t) = \delta\,|\boldsymbol{X}(t)| + \sqrt{1-\delta^2}X_{m+1}(t), \quad \text{with} \quad |\boldsymbol{X}(t)| = \big(\sum_{i=1}^{m} X_i^2(t)\big)^{1/2}, \quad t \geq 0. \tag{11}$$

We note that in the notion of [30] the process $\zeta_{1,\delta}$ is a skew-Gaussian process. Moreover, $\zeta_{m,1}$ is a χ-process with m degrees of freedom, and $\zeta_{m,0}$ is a stationary Gaussian process. Since, as discussed above, the stationary Gaussian process has been well studied, we shall focus on the case that $\delta \in (0,1]$. The following theorem gives the tail asymptotics of the supremum of the process $\zeta_{m,\delta}$ over a finite-time horizon. By $\mathcal{H}_\alpha$ we denote the Pickands constant, determined by

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha = \lim_{a \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{a}\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{k\geq 1} \xi_0(ak) \leq 0\right) \in (0,\infty), \tag{12}$$

with ξ_0 given as in (10).

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\{\zeta_{m,\delta}(t), t \geq 0\}$, with $\delta \in (0,1]$, be the generalized stationary skew-Gaussian process given by* (11)*. Assume that the generic stationary Gaussian process X has covariance function $\rho(\cdot)$ which satisfies* (9)*. Then, for any $T > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \zeta_{m,\delta}(t) > u\right) = T\delta^{m-1}\mathcal{H}_\alpha \frac{2^{1-m/2}}{\Gamma(m/2)} u^{\frac{2}{\alpha}+m-2} \exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{2}\right)(1+o(1)),$$

as $u \to \infty$.

Remark 2.2. *The special case of Theorem 2.1, for $\delta = 1$, coincides with that obtained in Corollary 7.3 in* [24]*; see also* [15, 18].

The following corollary, concerning the tail asymptotics of the supremum of the order statistics processes generated by the process $\zeta_{m,\delta}$, is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1 and the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Corollary 2.3. *Let $\{X_{r:n}(t), t \geq 0\}$ be the rth order statistics process generated by the process $\zeta_{m,\delta}$ which satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.1. Then, for any $T > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} X_{r:n}(t) > u\right) = T\mathcal{A}_{r,\alpha}\frac{n!}{r!(n-r)!}\delta^{rm-r}\frac{2^{r-rm/2}}{(\Gamma(m/2))^r} u^{\frac{2}{\alpha}+rm-2r}\exp\left(-\frac{ru^2}{2}\right)(1+o(1)), \quad u \to \infty,$$

where the generalized Albin constant $\mathcal{A}_{r,\alpha}$ is determined by

$$\mathcal{A}_{r,\alpha} = \lim_{a\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{a}\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{k\geq 1}\min_{1\leq i\leq r}\xi_0^{(i)}(ak) \leq 0\right) \in (0,\infty), \tag{13}$$

with $\xi_0^{(i)}, i \leq n$ being n independent copies of ξ_0 given as in (10)*.*

In extreme value analysis (see, e.g., [11, 20, 24]), it is also of interest to find some normalizing constants $a_T > 0, b_T \in \mathbb{R}$ so that the linear normalization of the supremum $a_T\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} X_{r:n}(t) - b_T\Big)$ converges in

distribution as $T \to \infty$, where $X_{r:n}$ is the rth order statistics process generated by the stationary Gaussian process X. The following theorem gives a Gumbel limit result for $X_{n:n}$ generated by weakly dependent stationary Gaussian processes; see, e.g., [11, 20, 24].

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\{X_{n:n}(t), t \geq 0\}$ be the minimum order statistics process generated by the stationary Gaussian process X with covariance function $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfying (9). If further the Berman's condition $\rho(t)\ln t = o(1), t \to \infty$ is satisfied, then*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(a_T\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} X_{n:n}(t) - b_T \Big) \leq x \right) - \exp\left(-e^{-x}\right) \right| = 0, \tag{14}$$

where (set below $D := (n/2)^{n/2-1/\alpha}\mathcal{A}_{n,\alpha}(2\pi)^{-n/2}$ and recall $\mathcal{A}_{n,\alpha}$ in (13))

$$a_T = \sqrt{2n\ln T}, \quad b_T = \sqrt{(2/n)\ln T} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n\ln T}}\left(\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{n}{2}\right)\ln\ln T + \ln D\right), \quad T > 0. \tag{15}$$

Remarks 2.5. *a) It follows from the proof of Theorem 2.4 that a similar result still holds for the maximum order statistics process $X_{1:n}$ under the same condition (since (39) holds).*

b) In several applications it is of interest to consider a random time interval $\mathcal{T}_T$ instead of T; see e.g., [17, 27]. *As in* [27] *our result in* (14) *can be extended for random intervals; we omit that result since it can be shown with similar arguments as in the aforementioned paper.*

c) The deep contribution [25] *shows that besides Gumbel limit theorems, of interest for application is the growth of $\mathbb{E}\left((\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|X_{n:n}(t)|)^p\right)$ for given $p > 0$. Since the claim of Theorem 2.4 can be easily reformulated for $\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|X_{n:n}(t)|$, in view of Theorem 2.1 applying Lemma 4.5 in* [26] *we obtain the following result*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left(\Big(\frac{\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|X_{n:n}(t)|}{\sqrt{(2/n)\ln T}} \Big)^p \right) = 1, \tag{16}$$

which is commonly referred to as Seleznjev pth mean theorem.

3. Proofs

In this section, we present proofs of Theorem 1.1, Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.4. We shall rely on the methodology developed in the seminal paper [3]. As mentioned therein, checking the Albin's conditions for stationary processes is usually a hard task. In Section 3.1 we consider X to be a stationary process with a.s. continuous sample paths. In Sections 3.2 and 3.3 we concentrate on the special case where X is a centered stationary Gaussian process with a.s. continuous sample paths and covariance function $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfying (9).

3.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.1.** We begin with some preliminary lemmas that will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1. The next lemma plays a key role throughout the proofs. Since its proof is straightforward, we omit it. We shall set below $c_{n,r} := n!/(r!(n-r)!)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\{X_{r:n}(t), t \geq 0\}$ be the rth order statistics process generated by the stationary process X. Then, for any $t \geq 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_{r:n}(t) > u\right) = c_{n,r}\big(\mathbb{P}\left(X(t) > u\right)\big)^r(1+o(1)), \quad u \to \infty. \tag{17}$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\{X_{r:n}(t), t \geq 0\}$ be the rth order statistics process generated by the stationary process X. If condition A(D) holds for X, then $X_{r:n}(0)$ has df in the Gumbel MDA with scaling function $w_r(u) = rw(u)$. Further, for any grid of points $0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_d < \infty$ and all $y \in \mathrm{D}$ the joint convergence in distribution*

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big(w_r(u)(X_{r:n}(qt_1) - u), \ldots, w_r(u)(X_{r:n}(qt_d) - u)\Big)\Big|\Big(w_r(u)(X_{r:n}(0) - u) > ry\Big) \\ &\quad \xrightarrow{d} \Big(\min_{1\leq i\leq r} r\xi_y^{(i)}(t_1), \ldots, \min_{1\leq i\leq r} r\xi_y^{(i)}(t_d)\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

holds as $u \to \infty$, where $\xi_y^{(i)}, i \leq n$ are mutually independent copies of ξ_y as in condition A(D).

Proof of Lemma 3.2: First, by (3) and (17)

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_{r:n}(0) > u + \frac{x}{rw(u)}\right) = (1+o(1))\mathbb{P}\left(X_{r:n}(0) > u\right)e^{-x}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

meaning that $X_{r:n}(0)$ has df in the Gumbel MDA with scaling function $w_r(u) = rw(u)$.

Further, it follows from (4) that the convergence in distribution

$$\Big(X_{iu}(qt_1), \ldots, X_{iu}(qt_d)\Big)\Big|(X_{iu}(0) > ry) \xrightarrow{d} \Big(r\xi_y^{(i)}(t_1), \ldots, r\xi_y^{(i)}(t_d)\Big), \quad u \to \infty \tag{19}$$

holds for all $i \leq n$ and $y \in \mathrm{D}$, where $X_{iu}(t) = w_r(u)(X_i(t) - u)$. Let further $Y_{ru}(t) = w_r(u)\big(X_{r:n}(t) - u\big)$ and fix a grid of points $0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_d < \infty$. Next, we show that (18) holds when $r = n$. Indeed, for any given constants $y_1, \ldots, y_d \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{nu}(qt_1) > y_1, \ldots, Y_{nu}(qt_d) > y_d \Big| Y_{nu}(0) > ny\right) \\ &\quad = \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\leq i\leq n} X_{iu}(qt_1) > y_1, \ldots, \min_{1\leq i\leq n} X_{iu}(qt_d) > y_d, \min_{1\leq i\leq n} X_{iu}(0) > ny\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\leq i\leq n} X_{iu}(0) > ny\right)} \\ &\quad \to \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\leq i\leq n} n\xi_y^{(i)}(t_1) > y_1, \ldots, \min_{1\leq i\leq n} n\xi_y^{(i)}(t_d) > y_d\right) \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

as $u \to \infty$, where in the last derivation we used (19). Similarly, the claim of (18) holds for all $r < n$ if we show that, for any given constants $y_1, \ldots, y_d \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{ru}(qt_1) > y_1, \ldots, Y_{ru}(qt_d) > y_d \Big| Y_{ru}(0) > ry\right) \\ &\quad = \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{ru}(qt_1) > y_1, \ldots, Y_{ru}(qt_d) > y_d, Y_{ru}(0) > ry\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{ru}(0) > ry\right)} \\ &\quad = \frac{c_{n,r}\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\leq i\leq r} X_{iu}(qt_1) > y_1, \ldots, \min_{1\leq i\leq r} X_{iu}(qt_d) > y_d, \min_{1\leq i\leq r} X_{iu}(0) > ry\right)}{c_{n,r}\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\leq i\leq r} X_{iu}(0) > ry\right)}(1+\Upsilon_r(u)) \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

as $u \to \infty$, with $\lim_{u\to\infty} \Upsilon_r(u) = 0$. In the following, we only present the proof for the case that $r = n-1$ and $d = 1$; the other cases follow by similar arguments. Note that by (17)

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{(n-1)u}(0) > (n-1)y\right) = n\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\le i\le n-1} X_{iu}(0) > (n-1)y\right)(1+o(1))$$

as $u \to \infty$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{(n-1)u}(qt_1) > y_1, Y_{(n-1)u}(0) > (n-1)y\right)\\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(Y_{(n-1)u}(qt_1) > y_1 \ge Y_{nu}(qt_1), Y_{nu}(0) > (n-1)y\right)\\
&\quad +\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{nu}(qt_1) > y_1, Y_{(n-1)u}(0) > (n-1)y \ge Y_{nu}(0)\right)\\
&\quad +\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{(n-1)u}(qt_1) > y_1 \ge Y_{nu}(qt_1), Y_{(n-1)u}(0) > (n-1)y \ge Y_{nu}(0)\right)\\
&\quad +\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{nu}(qt_1) > y_1, Y_{nu}(0) > (n-1)y\right)\\
&=: I_{1u} + I_{2u} + I_{3u} + I_{4u}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since in view of (3) and (4), as $u \to \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_{nu}(qt_1) \le y_1, X_{nu}(0) > (n-1)y\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\xi_y(t_1) \le \frac{y_1}{n-1}\right)\mathbb{P}\left(X_n(0) > u\right)e^{-y}(1+o(1)) = o(1),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{1u} &= n\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\le i\le n-1} X_{iu}(qt_1) > y_1, \min_{1\le i\le n-1} X_{iu}(0) > (n-1)y\right)\mathbb{P}\left(X_{nu}(qt_1) \le y_1, X_{nu}(0) > (n-1)y\right)\\
&= n\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\le i\le n-1} X_{iu}(qt_1) > y_1, \min_{1\le i\le n-1} X_{iu}(0) > (n-1)y\right)o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly $I_{2u} = n\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\le i\le n-1} X_{iu}(qt_1) > y_1, \min_{1\le i\le n-1} X_{iu}(0) > (n-1)y\right)o(1)$. Using further the fact that $\mathbb{P}\left(X_{nu}(qt_1) \le y_1, X_{nu}(0) \le (n-1)y\right) = 1 + o(1)$, as $u \to \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{3u} &= \sum_{i,i'\le n} \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\le j\le n, j\ne i} X_{ju}(qt_1) > y_1, X_{iu}(qt_1) \le y_1, \min_{1\le j'\le n, j'\ne i'} X_{j'u}(0) > (n-1)y, X_{i'u}(0) \le (n-1)y\right)\\
&= n\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\le j\le n-1} X_{ju}(qt_1) > y_1, \min_{1\le j'\le n-1} X_{j'u}(0) > (n-1)y\right)\mathbb{P}\left(X_{nu}(qt_1) \le y_1, X_{nu}(0) \le (n-1)y\right)\\
&\quad +c_{n,2}\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\le j\le n-2} X_{ju}(qt_1) > y_1, \min_{1\le j'\le n-2} X_{j'u}(0) > (n-1)y\right)\\
&\qquad \times\mathbb{P}\left(X_{(n-1)u}(qt_1) \le y_1, X_{(n-1)u}(0) > (n-1)y\right)\mathbb{P}\left(X_{nu}(qt_1) > y_1, X_{nu}(0) \le (n-1)y\right)\\
&= n\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\le j\le n-1} X_{ju}(qt_1) > y_1, \min_{1\le j'\le n-1} X_{j'u}(0) > (n-1)y\right)(1+o(1)).
\end{aligned}$$

Since in view of (20) as $u \to \infty$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\le j\le n-k} X_{ju}(qt_1) > y_1, \min_{1\le j'\le n-k} X_{j'u}(0) > (n-1)y\right) = \left(\mathbb{P}\left(X(0) > u\right)\right)^{n-k} O(1), \quad k = 0,1,2,$$

we conclude that (21) holds for $r = n-1$ and $d = 1$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\{X_{r:n}(t), t \geq 0\}$ be the rth order statistics process generated by the stationary process X. If condition B is satisfied by X, then for any a, T positive*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \limsup_{u\to\infty} \sum_{k=N}^{[T/(aq)]} \mathbb{P}\left(X_{r:n}(aqk) > u | X_{r:n}(0) > u\right) = 0. \tag{22}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.3: First, since for all integers $k \geq 1$ and any $u \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(X_{n:n}(aqk) > u | X_{n:n}(0) > u\right) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X_{n:n}(aqk) > u, X_{n:n}(0) > u\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(X_{n:n}(0) > u\right)} \\ &= \Big(\mathbb{P}\left(X(aqk) > u | X(0) > u\right)\Big)^n \leq \mathbb{P}\left(X(aqk) > u | X(0) > u\right)\end{aligned}$$

holds, we have from condition B that the claim follows for $r = n$.

Next, we show the proof for any $r < n$. Similar arguments as in (21) yield that, as $u \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(X_{r:n}(aqk) > u \Big| X_{r:n}(0) > u\right) &= \left(\mathbb{P}\left(X(aqk) > u \Big| X(0) > u\right)\right)^r (1 + \Upsilon_r(u)) \\ &\leq K\left(\mathbb{P}\left(X(aqk) > u \Big| X(0) > u\right)\right)^r\end{aligned}$$

holds for some $K > 0$. Consequently, the proof for $r < n$ is completed by an application of condition B. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\{X_{r:n}(t), t \geq 0\}$ be the rth order statistics process generated by the stationary process X. If condition C is satisfied by X with the parameters as therein, then there exists some positive constant C^* such that for all u large*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_{r:n}(qt) > u + \frac{\lambda}{w(u)}, X_{r:n}(0) \leq u \Big| X_{r:n}(qt) > u\right) \leq C^* t^d \lambda^{-b} \tag{23}$$

holds for any t satisfying $0 < t^\rho < \lambda < \lambda_0$.

Proof of Lemma 3.4: First we show the proof for $r = n$. We have by condition C that, for sufficiently large u and $C^* = nC$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(X_{n:n}(qt) > u + \frac{\lambda}{w(u)}, X_{n:n}(0) \leq u \Big| X_{n:n}(qt) > u\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X_{n:n}(qt) > u + \frac{\lambda}{w(u)}, X_i(0) \leq u, X_{n:n}(qt) > u\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(X_{n:n}(qt) > u\right)} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X_i(qt) > u + \frac{\lambda}{w(u)}, X_i(0) \leq u, \min_{1\leq j\leq n, j\neq i} X_j(qt) > u\right)}{\left(\mathbb{P}\left(X(0) > u\right)\right)^n} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X_i(qt) > u + \frac{\lambda}{w(u)}, X_i(0) \leq u\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(X(0) > u\right)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}\left(X_i(qt) > u + \frac{\lambda}{w(u)}, X_i(0) \leq u \Big| X_i(qt) > u\right) \\ &\leq C^* t^d \lambda^{-b} \qquad (24)\end{aligned}$$

for all t satisfying $0 < t^\rho < \lambda < \lambda_0$. Thus the claim for $r = n$ follows. Next, we present the proof for the case that $r < n$. We have with similar arguments as in (21) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(X_{r:n}(qt) > u + \frac{\lambda}{w(u)}, X_{r:n}(0) \le u, X_{r:n}(qt) > u\right)\\ &\quad = c_{n,r}\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1\le i\le r} X_i(qt) > u + \frac{\lambda}{w(u)}, \min_{1\le i\le r} X_i(0) \le u, \min_{1\le i\le r} X_i(qt) > u\right)(1+o(1))\end{aligned}$$

as $u \to \infty$. Consequently, it follows further from (24) that there exists some positive constant C^* such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_{r:n}(qt) > u + \frac{\lambda}{w(u)}, X_{r:n}(0) \le \Big| X_{r:n}(qt) > u\right) \le C^* t^d \lambda^{-b}$$

holds for all t satisfying $0 < t^\rho < \lambda < \lambda_0$. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1: The proof is based on an application of Theorem 1 in [3] (see also Lemma A in [5]). It follows from Lemmas 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 that the conditions therein are established, and thus, for any $T > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} X_{r:n}(t) > u\right) = T\mathcal{A}_r \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X_{r:n}(0) > u\right)}{q(u)}(1+o(1)), \quad u \to \infty,$$

where $\mathcal{A}_r \in (0,\infty)$ is defined as in (7). Consequently, the claim follows from (17). This completes the proof. □

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.1.** In the following, we focus on the special case where the generic X is a centered stationary Gaussian process with a.s. continuous sample paths and covariance function $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfying (9). Before proceeding to the proof of Theorem 2.1, we present some preliminary lemmas (Lemmas 3.5–3.8).

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\{\zeta_{m,\delta}(t), t \ge 0\}$, $\delta \in (0,1]$ be given as in* (11)*. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right) = \delta^{m-1}\frac{2^{1-m/2}}{\Gamma(m/2)}u^{m-2}\exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{2}\right)(1+o(1))$$

and

$$|\boldsymbol{X}(0)| \,\Big|\, \left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right) \xrightarrow{p} \infty, \tag{25}$$

as $u \to \infty$.

Proof of Lemma 3.5: First recall that $|\boldsymbol{X}(0)|^2/2$ has $Gamma(m/2,1)$ distribution and thus

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\boldsymbol{X}(0)| > u\right) = \frac{2^{1-m/2}}{\Gamma(m/2)}u^{m-2}\exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{2}\right)(1+o(1)), \quad u \to \infty,$$

which in the terminology of [16] means that $|\boldsymbol{X}(0)|$ has a Gaussian-like tail. Consequently, Theorem 2.2 in [16] implies that, for any $\delta \in (0,1]$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right) = \delta^{m-1}\frac{2^{1-m/2}}{\Gamma(m/2)}u^{m-2}\exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{2}\right)(1+o(1)), \quad u \to \infty.$$

Clearly, (25) holds for $\delta = 1$. Next, taking a constant c such that $1 < c < 1/\sqrt{1-\delta^2}$ for $\delta \in (0,1)$, it follows from the proof of Lemma 2.3 in [16] that

$$\mathbb{P}\left((1-c\sqrt{1-\delta^2})u < \delta\,|\boldsymbol{X}(0)| < c\delta u \Big| \zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right) \to 1, \quad u \to \infty,$$

implying thus (25) holds. The proof is complete. □

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\{\zeta_{m,\delta}(t), t \geq 0\}$, $\delta \in (0,1]$ be given as in (11), where the covariance function $\rho(\cdot)$ of the generic stationary Gaussian process X satisfies (9). Then, with $q = q(u) = u^{-2/\alpha}$, for any grid of points $0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_d < \infty$, the joint convergence in distribution*

$$\Big(u(\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt_1) - u), \ldots, u(\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt_d) - u)\Big)\Big|(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u) \xrightarrow{d} \Big(\xi_0(t_1), \ldots, \xi_0(t_d)\Big) \tag{26}$$

holds as $u \to \infty$, where the process ξ_0 is given as in (10).

Proof of Lemma 3.6: By Lemma 3.5, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{u\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u + \frac{s}{w(u)}\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right)} = e^{-s},$$

with $w(u) = u$. This can be rephrased in terms of convergence in distribution as

$$u(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) - u)\Big|(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) - u > 0) \xrightarrow{d} E, \quad u \to \infty,$$

with E the unit exponential rv. In view of Theorem 5.1 in [10], it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big(u(\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt_1) - u), \ldots, u(\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt_d) - u)\Big)\Big|(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) = u_x) \\ &\xrightarrow{d} \Big(\sqrt{2}Z(t_1) - t_1^\alpha + x, \ldots, \sqrt{2}Z(t_d) - t_d^\alpha + x\Big), \quad u \to \infty \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

holds for all $d \geq 1$ and almost all $0 < x < \infty$, where $u_x := u + x/u$ and the random process Z is the fBm given as in (10). Define

$$X_{iu} = \rho(qt_j)X_i(0), \quad \Delta_{iu}(t_j) = X_i(qt_j) - X_{iu}, \quad i \leq m+1,\ j \leq d.$$

For any $u > 0$ and $j \leq d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\big(u[\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt_j) - u] - x\big)\Big|(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) = u_x) \\ &= u\left(\delta\left(\sum_{i=1}^m (X_{iu} + \Delta_{iu}(t_j))^2\right)^{1/2} + \sqrt{1-\delta^2}\Big(X_{m+1u} + \Delta_{(m+1)u}(t_j)\Big) - \zeta_{m,\delta}(0)\right)\Big|(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) = u_x) \\ &= u\left(\delta\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \big(X_i^2(0) + 2X_{iu}\Delta_{iu}(t_j) - (1-\rho^2(qt_j))X_i^2(0) + \Delta_{iu}^2(t_j)\big)\right)^{1/2} - \Big(\sum_{i=1}^m X_i^2(0)\Big)^{1/2}\right)\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{1-\delta^2}\Big(\Delta_{(m+1)u}(t_j) - (1-\rho(qt_j))X_{m+1}(0)\Big)\right)\Big|(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) = u_x) \\ &=: \delta A_u + \sqrt{1-\delta^2}B_u. \end{aligned}$$

Let $Z_i, i \leq m+1$ be $m+1$ independent copies of the fBm Z given as in (10). In view of (9), we have

$$u^2\mathbf{Cov}(\Delta_{iu}(s), \Delta_{iu}(t)) \to s^\alpha + t^\alpha - |s-t|^\alpha = 2\mathbf{Cov}(Z_i(s), Z_i(t)), \quad s,t > 0, \quad i \leq m+1 \tag{28}$$

holds as $u \to \infty$, which implies the convergence of finite-dimensional distributions of the following processes

$$\{u\Delta_{iu}(t), t \geq 0\} \xrightarrow{d} \{\sqrt{2}Z_i(t), t \geq 0\}, \quad u \to \infty, \quad i \leq m+1.$$

By the independence of Δ_{iu}'s and X_{iu}'s, the random processes Z_i's can be chosen such that they are independent of $\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)$. Furthermore, since $(X_1(0), \ldots, X_{m+1}(0))$ is an $(m+1)$-dimensional centered Gaussian random vector with $N(0,1)$ independent components, we have the stochastic representation (cf. [12])

$$(X_1(0), \ldots, X_m(0), X_{m+1}(0)) \stackrel{d}{=} R(\boldsymbol{O}B, I\sqrt{1-B^2}), \tag{29}$$

where $\boldsymbol{O} = (O_1, \ldots, O_m)$ is a random vector uniformly distributed on the unit sphere of $\mathbb{R}^m$. Here the rv I satisfies $\mathbb{P}(I = \pm 1) = 1/2$, the random radius $R > 0$ a.s. is such that R^2 has chi-square distribution with $m+1$ degrees of freedom, and the rv B is supported in $(0,1)$ a.s. such that B^2 is Beta distributed with parameters $m/2, 1/2$. Moreover, $\boldsymbol{O}, I, R, B, Z_i, i \leq m+1$ are mutually independent.

Consequently, using Taylor's expansion together with (28) and (29) we obtain, as $u \to \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}
A_u &= |\boldsymbol{X}(0)|^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{2} X_i(0) Z_i(t_j) - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m X_i^2(0)}{u} t_j^\alpha + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m Z_i^2(t_j)}{u} \right) (1 + o_p(1)) \Big| (\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) = u_x) \\
&\stackrel{d}{=} \left(\sqrt{2} \sum_{i=1}^m O_i Z_i(t_j) - \frac{RB}{u} t_j^\alpha + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m Z_i^2(t_j)}{uRB} \right) (1 + o_p(1)) \Big| (R(\delta B + \sqrt{1-\delta^2}\sqrt{1-B^2} I) = u_x) \\
B_u &\stackrel{d}{=} \Big(\sqrt{2} Z_{m+1}(t_j) - \frac{R\sqrt{1-B^2} I}{u} t_j^\alpha \Big) (1 + o_p(1)) \Big| (\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) = u_x).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the following stochastic representation (cf. [19])

$$\sum_{i=1}^m O_i Z_i(t_j) \stackrel{d}{=} Z_1(t_j) \Big(\sum_{i=1}^m O_i^2 \Big)^{1/2} = Z_1(t_j)$$

holds, we have further by (25)

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta A_u + \sqrt{1-\delta^2} B_u \quad &\stackrel{d}{=} \quad \left(\sqrt{2} \Big(\delta \sum_{i=1}^m O_i Z_i(t_j) + \sqrt{1-\delta^2} Z_{m+1}(t_j) \Big) - \frac{R(\delta B + \sqrt{1-\delta^2}\sqrt{1-B^2} I)}{u} t_j^\alpha \right. \\
&\qquad \left. + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m Z_i^2(t_j)}{uRB} \right) (1 + o_p(1)) \Big| (R(\delta B + \sqrt{1-\delta^2}\sqrt{1-B^2} I) = u_x) \\
&\qquad \xrightarrow{d} \sqrt{2} Z(t_j) - t_j^\alpha, \quad u \to \infty
\end{aligned}$$

establishing the convergence for any fixed $t_j > 0$. The joint convergence in distribution for $0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_d < \infty$ can be shown with similar arguments and is therefore omitted here. □

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\{\zeta_{m,\delta}(t), t \geq 0\}$, $\delta \in (0,1]$ be given as in (11), where the covariance function $\rho(\cdot)$ of the generic stationary Gaussian process X satisfies (9). Then, with $q = q(u) = u^{-2/\alpha}$, for any $T > 0$ and $a > 0$*

$$\limsup_{u \to \infty} \sum_{j=N}^{[T/(aq)]} \mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(aqj) > u \Big| \zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u \right) \to 0, \quad N \to \infty.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.7: It follows from (9) that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough

$$\frac{1}{2}t^{\alpha} \leq 1 - \rho(t) \leq 2t^{\alpha}, \quad \forall t \in (0, \epsilon].$$

Denote by $\boldsymbol{X}(qt) - \rho(qt)\boldsymbol{X}(0) = (X_1(qt) - \rho(t)X_1(0), \ldots, X_m(qt) - \rho(qt)X_m(0))$, and define

$$\zeta^*_{m,\delta}(qt) \equiv \delta\,|\boldsymbol{X}(qt) - \rho(qt)\boldsymbol{X}(0)| + \sqrt{1-\delta^2}(X_{m+1}(qt) - \rho(qt)X_{m+1}(0)). \tag{30}$$

Since $X(qt) - \rho(qt)X(0)$ is independent of $X(0)$, and $X(qt) - \rho(qt)X(0) \stackrel{d}{=} \sqrt{1-\rho^2(qt)}X(0)$, we have that $\zeta^*_{m,\delta}(qt)$ is independent of $\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)$, and

$$\zeta^*_{m,\delta}(qt) \stackrel{d}{=} \sqrt{1-\rho^2(qt)}\zeta_{m,\delta}(0).$$

Moreover, by the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta^*_{m,\delta}(qt) &\geq \Big(\delta\,|\boldsymbol{X}(qt)| + \sqrt{1-\delta^2}X_{m+1}(qt)\Big) - \rho(qt)\Big(\delta\,|\boldsymbol{X}(0)| + \sqrt{1-\delta^2}X_{m+1}(0)\Big)\\ &= \zeta_{m,\delta}(qt) - \rho(qt)\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u(1-\rho(qt)), \quad \text{provided that } \zeta_{m,\delta}(qt) > \zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt) > u \middle| \zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right) &\leq 2\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt) > \zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right)}\\ &\leq 2\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta^*_{m,\delta}(qt) > u(1-\rho(qt)), \zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right)}\\ &= 2\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\sqrt{\frac{1-\rho(qt)}{1+\rho(qt)}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it follows from Chebyshev's inequality and Lemma 3.5 that for any $p > m$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt) > u \middle| \zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right) &\leq \begin{cases} 2^{1+p}\frac{\mathbb{E}(|\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)|^p)}{t^{\alpha p/2}}, & qt \in (0,\epsilon],\\ 2\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{2}}\right), & qt \in (\epsilon, T]\end{cases}\\ &\leq \begin{cases} K_p t^{-\alpha p/2}, & qt \in (0,\epsilon],\\ K_p u^{m-1-p}, & qt \in (\epsilon, T]\end{cases}\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

is satisfied for some positive constant K_p, where $\lambda = 1 - \sup_{\epsilon < s \leq T}\rho(s) > 0$, and the second inequality is due to the fact that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right) \leq Cu^{m-1}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}u}\exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{2}\right) \leq C_p u^{m-1-p}, \quad u > 0$$

holds for some positive constants C and C_p. Moreover, letting $p = 2(2/\alpha + m - 1)$ we conclude that for $t \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt) > u \middle| \zeta_{m,\delta}(0) > u\right) &\leq K_p(1 + T^{\alpha(p-m+1)/2})\max(t^{-\alpha p/2}, t^{-\alpha(p-m+1)/2})\\ &\leq C_p t^{-2}, \quad qt \in (0, T].\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\limsup_{u\to\infty}\sum_{j=N}^{[T/(aq)]}\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(aqj)>u\Big|\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)>u\right)\le C_p\sum_{j=N}^{\infty}(aj)^{-2}\to 0,\quad N\to\infty$$

establishing the proof. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let* $\{\zeta_{m,\delta}(t), t\ge 0\}$, $\delta\in(0,1]$ *be given as in* (11)*, where the covariance function* $\rho(\cdot)$ *of the generic stationary Gaussian process* X *satisfies* (9)*. Then, with* $q=q(u)=u^{-2/\alpha}$*, there exist some constants* $C,p>0,d>1$ *and* $\lambda_0,u_0>0$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt)>u+\frac{\lambda}{u},\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)\le u\right)\le Ct^d\lambda^{-p}\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)>u\right)$$

for any t *satisfying* $0<t^{\alpha/2}<\lambda<\lambda_0$ *and* $u>u_0$*.*

Proof of Lemma 3.8: In view of (9), we have that there exists some constant $\epsilon>0$ such that

$$\rho(t)\ge\frac{1}{2}\quad\text{and}\quad 1-\rho(t)\le 2t^\alpha$$

for all $t\in(0,\epsilon]$. Further, for any t satisfying $0<t^{\alpha/2}<\lambda<\lambda_0:=\min(1/8,\epsilon^{\alpha/2})$ and $u>1$

$$\frac{1}{\rho(qt)}-1\le 4\frac{t^\alpha}{u^2}\le\frac{\lambda}{2u^2}.$$

Moreover, letting

$$\boldsymbol{X}_{1/\rho}(qt)=(X_1(qt)-\rho^{-1}(qt)X_1(0),\ldots,X_m(qt)-\rho^{-1}(qt)X_m(0))$$

we have by the triangle inequality

$$|\boldsymbol{X}(qt)|\le\left|\boldsymbol{X}_{1/\rho}(qt)\right|+\frac{1}{\rho(qt)}\left|\boldsymbol{X}(0)\right|.$$

Further, letting

$$\zeta^{**}_{m,\delta}(qt)\equiv\delta\left|\boldsymbol{X}_{1/\rho}(qt)\right|+\sqrt{1-\delta^2}\left(X_{m+1}(qt)-\rho^{-1}(qt)X_{m+1}(0)\right),$$

and by utilising similar arguments as for $\zeta^*_{m,\delta}$ given in (30), we have that $\zeta^{**}_{m,\delta}(qt)$ is independent of $\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt)$ and $\zeta^{**}_{m,\delta}(qt)\overset{d}{=}\sqrt{1-\rho^2(qt)}/\rho(qt)\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)$. Therefore, for any t satisfying $0<t^{\alpha/2}<\lambda<\lambda_0$ and $u>1$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt)>u+\frac{\lambda}{u},\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)\le u\Big|\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt)>u\right)\\
&\quad\le\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta^{**}_{m,\delta}(qt)>\frac{\lambda}{u}+u-\frac{\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)}{\rho(qt)},\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)\le u\Big|\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt)>u\right)\\
&\quad\le\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta^{**}_{m,\delta}(qt)>\frac{\lambda}{u}-\left(\frac{1}{\rho(qt)}-1\right)u\Big|\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt)>u\right)\\
&\quad\le\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta^{**}_{m,\delta}(qt)>\frac{\lambda}{2u}\right)=\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)>\frac{\rho(qt)}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2(qt)}}\frac{\lambda}{2u}\right)\\
&\quad\le\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)>\frac{\lambda}{8t^{\alpha/2}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by Chebyshev's inequality, we obtain that, for any positive constant $p > 2/\alpha$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt) > u + \frac{\lambda}{u}, \zeta_{m,\delta}(0) \le u\right) \le 8^p \mathbb{E}\left(|\zeta_{m,\delta}(0)|^p\right) t^{\alpha p/2} \lambda^{-p} \mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{m,\delta}(qt) > u\right)$$

holds for any t satisfying $0 < t^{\alpha/2} < \lambda < \lambda_0$ and u large. Thus the proof is complete. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1: With Lemma 3.5–Lemma 3.8, we conclude that the claim follows by an application of Theorem 1 in [3] (see also Lemma A in [5]). □

3.3. **Proof of Theorem 2.4.** In view of [3, 5] or [20], we need to verify two additional conditions (see Lemmas 3.9 and 3.10) for the order statistics processes generated by the stationary Gaussian process X.

Lemma 3.9. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.4 we have, for any constants $a, T > 0$*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \limsup_{u \to \infty} \sum_{j=[T/(aq)]}^{[\varepsilon/\mathbb{P}(X_{n:n}(0)>u)]} \mathbb{P}\left(X_{n:n}(aqj) > u \Big| X_{n:n}(0) > u\right) = 0. \tag{32}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.9: Using that $X(t) - \rho(t)X(0)$ is independent of $X(0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(X_{n:n}(t) > u \Big| X_{n:n}(0) > u\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(X_{n:n}(t) > u, X_{n:n}(0) > u \Big| X_{n:n}(0) > u\right) \\
&= 2^n \left(\mathbb{P}\left(X(t) > X(0) > u \Big| X(0) > u\right)\right)^n \\
&\le 2^n \left(\mathbb{P}\left(X(t) - \rho(t)X(0) > u(1-\rho(t)), X(0) > u \Big| X(0) > u\right)\right)^n \\
&= 2^n \left(\Psi\left(u\sqrt{\frac{1-\rho(t)}{1+\rho(t)}}\right)\right)^n \\
&\le 2^n \left(\Psi\left(u\sqrt{\frac{1-|\rho(t)|}{1+|\rho(t)|}}\right)\right)^n \\
&\le K u^{-n} \left(\frac{1-\widetilde{\rho}(t)}{1+\widetilde{\rho}(t)}\right)^{-n/2} \exp\left(-\frac{nu^2}{2}\frac{1-\widetilde{\rho}(t)}{1+\widetilde{\rho}(t)}\right) \qquad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

holds for some positive constant K and u large (the constant K below may be different from line to line). Here $\widetilde{\rho}(t) = \sup\{|\rho(s)| : s \ge t\}$ and $\Psi(\cdot)$ is the survival function of an $N(0,1)$ random variable.

Since $\widetilde{\rho}(t)$ is non-increasing with respect to t, there exists a positive function $g(u) \to \infty$ as $u \to \infty$, such that $\widetilde{\rho}(g(u)) = u^{-2}$. Further it follows from $u^{-2} \ln g(u) = o(1)$ that $g(u) \le \exp(\epsilon' u^2)$ for some $0 < \epsilon' < n/2(1-\widetilde{\rho}(T))/(1+\widetilde{\rho}(T))$ and sufficiently large u. Now we split the sum in (32) at $aqj = g(u)$. The first term satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=[T/(aq)]}^{[g(u)/(aq)]} \mathbb{P}\left(X_{n:n}(aqj) > u \Big| X_{n:n}(0) > u\right) \\
&\quad \le K \frac{g(u)}{aq} u^{-n} \left(\frac{1-\widetilde{\rho}(T)}{1+\widetilde{\rho}(T)}\right)^{-n/2} \exp\left(-\frac{nu^2}{2}\frac{1-\widetilde{\rho}(T)}{1+\widetilde{\rho}(T)}\right) \\
&\quad \le K u^{2/\alpha - n} \exp\left(\epsilon' u^2 - \frac{nu^2}{2}\frac{1-\widetilde{\rho}(T)}{1+\widetilde{\rho}(T)}\right) \\
&\quad \to 0, \quad u \to \infty
\end{aligned}$$

since $\epsilon' < n/2(1-\widetilde{\rho}(T))/(1+\widetilde{\rho}(T))$. For the remaining term we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=[g(u)/(aq)]}^{[\varepsilon/\mathbb{P}(X_{n:n}(0)>u)]} \mathbb{P}\left(X_{n:n}(aqj) > u \middle| X_{n:n}(0) > u\right) \\
&\quad \le K \frac{\varepsilon}{\mathbb{P}\left(X_{n:n}(0) > u\right)} u^{-n} \left(\frac{1-u^{-2}}{1+u^{-2}}\right)^{-n/2} \exp\left(-\frac{nu^2}{2}\frac{1-u^{-2}}{1+u^{-2}}\right) \\
&\quad \le K\varepsilon \exp\left(-\frac{nu^2}{2}\left(\frac{1-u^{-2}}{1+u^{-2}} - 1\right)\right) \\
&\quad \le K\varepsilon, \quad u \to \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the claim follows by taking $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. □

In the following lemma we shall establish the asymptotic independence of $X_{n:n}$ over suitable separate intervals (see condition D' in [3]). In the notation used below $\mathcal{A}_{n,\alpha}$ is the constant given as in (13), and

$$T = T(u) = \frac{(2\pi)^{n/2}}{\mathcal{A}_{n,\alpha}} u^{n-\frac{2}{\alpha}} \exp\left(\frac{nu^2}{2}\right). \tag{34}$$

Lemma 3.10. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.4, if futher $T = T(u)$ is defined by (34) and $a > 0, 0 < \lambda < 1$ are given constants, then for any $0 \le s_1 < \cdots < s_p < t_1 < \cdots < t_{p'}$ in $\{aqj : j \in \mathcal{Z}, 0 \le aqj \le T\}$ with $t_1 - s_p \ge \lambda T$, we have, as $u \to \infty$*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Bigg| \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{p}\{X_{n:n}(s_i) \le u\}, \bigcap_{j=1}^{p'}\{X_{n:n}(t_j) \le u\}\right) \\
&\qquad -\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{p}\{X_{n:n}(s_i) \le u\}\right)\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{p'}\{X_{n:n}(t_j) \le u\}\right)\Bigg| \to 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.10: First, taking logarithms on both sides of (34) we obtain

$$\ln T = \frac{nu^2}{2} + \left(n - \frac{2}{\alpha}\right)\ln u + \ln\frac{(2\pi)^{n/2}}{\mathcal{A}_{n,\alpha}}$$

which together with $u^2 = (2/n)\ln T(1+o(1))$ implies that

$$u^2 = \frac{2}{n}\ln T + \left(\frac{2}{n\alpha} - 1\right)\ln\ln T + \ln\left(\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{1-2/(n\alpha)}\frac{(\mathcal{A}_{n,\alpha})^{2/n}}{2\pi}\right)(1+o(1)) \tag{36}$$

as $T \to \infty$. Further, define (hereafter $\mathbb{I}\{\cdot\}$ denotes the indicator function)

$$X_{ij} = X_j(s_i)\mathbb{I}\{i \le p\} + X_j(t_{i-p})\mathbb{I}\{p < i \le p+p'\}, \quad 1 \le i \le p+p',\ 1 \le j \le n,$$

and $\{Y_{ij}, 1 \le i \le p, 1 \le j \le n\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{X_{ij}, 1 \le i \le p, 1 \le j \le n\}$, independent of $\{Y_{ij}, p+1 \le i \le p+p', 1 \le j \le n\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{X_{ij}, p+1 \le i \le p+p', 1 \le j \le n\}$. Applying Lemma 4.2 with $X_{i(n)} = X_{n:n}(s_i)\mathbb{I}\{i \le p\} + X_{n:n}(t_{i-p})\mathbb{I}\{p < i \le p+p'\}$ (see the Appendix), and using the similar arguments as in Lemma 8.2.4 in [20] we obtain that the

left-hand side of (35) is bounded from above by

$$Ku^{-2(n-1)}\left(\frac{T}{q}\right)\sum_{\lambda T\le t_j-s_i\le T}\exp\left(-\frac{nu^2}{1+|\rho(t_j-s_i)|}\right)\int_0^{|\rho(t_j-s_i)|}\frac{(1+|h|)^{2(n-1)}}{(1-h^2)^{n/2}}\,dh$$
$$\le Ku^{-2(n-1)}\left(\frac{T}{q}\right)\sum_{\lambda T\le aqj\le T}|\rho(aqj)|\exp\left(-\frac{nu^2}{1+|\rho(aqj)|}\right),\quad \text{for sufficiently large } u,$$

where K is some positive constant (the constant K below may be different from line to line).

Next, letting $\delta(t)=\sup\{|\rho(s)|\ln s: s\ge t\}, t\ge 1$, we have that $|\rho(t)|\le \delta(t)/\ln t$ and $\delta(t)\le M$ for some positive constant M and all sufficiently large t. Therefore, by (36)

$$\begin{aligned}\exp\left(-\frac{nu^2}{1+|\rho(aqj)|}\right) &\le \exp\left(-nu^2\left(1-\frac{\delta(\lambda T)}{\ln(\lambda T)}\right)\right)\\ &\le K\exp\left(-nu^2\right)\\ &\le KT^{-2}(\ln T)^{n-2/\alpha}\end{aligned}$$

holds for T large. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}&Ku^{-2(n-1)}\frac{T}{q}\sum_{\lambda T\le aqj\le T}|\rho(aqj)|\exp\left(-\frac{nu^2}{1+|\rho(aqj)|}\right)\\ &\le Ku^{-2(n-1)}\left(\frac{T}{q}\right)^2\frac{1}{T/q}\sum_{\lambda T\le aqj\le T}|\rho(aqj)|\ln(aqj)\frac{1}{\ln(\lambda T)}T^{-2}(\ln T)^{n-2/\alpha}\\ &\le K\frac{1}{T/q}\sum_{\lambda T\le aqj\le T}|\rho(aqj)|\ln(aqj),\end{aligned}$$

which tends to 0 as $T\to\infty$ since $\rho(t)\ln t=o(1)$. Hence the proof is complete. □

Proof of Theorem 2.4: Since Theorem 2.1 and Lemmas 3.9 and 3.10 hold for the nth order statistics process $X_{n:n}$, in view of Lemma B in [5] we have, for $T=T(u)$ defined as in (34)

$$\lim_{u\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T(u)]}X_{n:n}(t)\le u+\frac{x}{nu}\right)=\exp\left(-e^{-x}\right),\quad x\in\mathbb{R}.$$

Expressing u in terms of T as in (36) we conclude that the claim follows with a_T, b_T defined as in (15). □

4. Appendix: Li and Shao's Comparison Lemma for Minimum and Maximum

Let $\boldsymbol{X}=(X_1,\dots,X_d)$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}=(Y_1,\dots,Y_d)$ be two Gaussian random vectors with $N(0,1)$ components and covariance matrices $\Sigma^1=(\sigma_{ij}^{(1)})$ and $\Sigma^0=(\sigma_{ij}^{(0)})$, respectively. The most elaborated version of Berman's inequality is due to Li and Shao [21], where it is shown that for arbitrary real constants $u_i, i\le d$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_i\le u_i, i\le d\right)-\mathbb{P}\left(Y_i\le u_i, i\le d\right)\le\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{1\le i<j\le d}A_{ij}^1\exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2+u_j^2}{2(1+\rho_{ij})}\right),$$

where $\rho_{ij}:=\max(|\sigma_{ij}^{(1)}|,|\sigma_{ij}^{(0)}|), A_{ij}^1:=\max\left(0,\arcsin(\sigma_{ij}^{(1)})-\arcsin(\sigma_{ij}^{(0)})\right)$. Thus

$$\left|\mathbb{P}\left(X_i\le u_i, i\le d\right)-\mathbb{P}\left(Y_i\le u_i, i\le d\right)\right|\le\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{1\le i<j\le d}A_{ij}\exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2+u_j^2}{2(1+\rho_{ij})}\right),\tag{37}$$

where $A_{ij} := \left|\arcsin(\sigma_{ij}^{(1)}) - \arcsin(\sigma_{ij}^{(0)})\right|$.

Our goal is to establish Li and Shao's extension of comparison lemma (Berman's inequality) for the minimum and the maximum order statistics of Gaussian random vectors. Let therefore $\boldsymbol{X}_j = (X_{ij}, i \le d)$, $j \le n$ be n independent copies of $\boldsymbol{X}$. Denote the minimum and maximum order statistics vector $\boldsymbol{X}_{n:n} = (X_{i(n)}, i \le d), \boldsymbol{X}_{1:n} = (X_{i(1)}, i \le d)$ with $X_{i(n)} = \min_{j\le n} X_{ij}, X_{i(1)} = \max_{j\le n} X_{ij}, i \le d$. Similarly, we write $\boldsymbol{Y}_j, j \le n$ as n independent copies of $\boldsymbol{Y}$, and define the minimum and maximum order statistics vectors $\boldsymbol{Y}_{n:n}$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}_{1:n}$. In what follows, denote $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, \ldots, u_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and for any $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ write $\boldsymbol{x} \le \boldsymbol{y}$ if $x_i \le y_i$ for all $i \le d$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{X}_{n:n}, \boldsymbol{Y}_{n:n}$ and $\boldsymbol{X}_{1:n}, \boldsymbol{Y}_{1:n}$ be the minimum and maximum order statistics vectors defined above. Then, for arbitrary real constant vector $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\left|\mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_{n:n} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{Y}_{n:n} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right)\right| \le \frac{n}{2\pi} \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} A_{ij} \exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2 + u_j^2}{2(1+\rho_{ij})}\right) \tag{38}$$

and

$$\left|\mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_{1:n} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{Y}_{1:n} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right)\right| \le \frac{n}{2\pi} \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} A_{ij} \exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2 + u_j^2}{2(1+\rho_{ij})}\right). \tag{39}$$

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\boldsymbol{X}_{n:n}$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}_{n:n}$ be the minimum order statistics vectors defined above. Then, for all $\boldsymbol{u} > \boldsymbol{0}$*

$$\left|\mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_{n:n} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{Y}_{n:n} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right)\right| \le \frac{n}{(2\pi)^n} u^{-2(n-1)} \sum_{1\le i<l\le d} |A_{il}^*| \exp\left(-\frac{nu^2}{1+\rho_{il}}\right),$$

where $u = \min_{1\le i\le n} u_i$ and

$$A_{il}^* = \int_{\sigma_{il}^{(0)}}^{\sigma_{il}^{(1)}} \frac{(1+|h|)^{2(n-1)}}{(1-h^2)^{n/2}}\, dh. \tag{40}$$

Proof of Lemma 4.1: Note that $-\boldsymbol{X}$ and $-\boldsymbol{Y}$ have the same distributions as those of $\boldsymbol{X}$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}$, respectively. Using Theorem 2.1 in [22] with constants $\lambda_{ij} = -u_i, i \le d, j \le n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_{n:n} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{Y}_{n:n} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right) \\
&\quad = \mathbb{P}\left(\cap_{i=1}^d \cup_{j=1}^n \{X_{ij} < u_i\}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\cap_{i=1}^d \cup_{j=1}^n \{Y_{ij} < u_i\}\right) \\
&\quad = \mathbb{P}\left(\cup_{i=1}^d \cap_{j=1}^n \{-Y_{ij} < -u_i\}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\cup_{i=1}^d \cap_{j=1}^n \{-X_{ij} < -u_i\}\right) \\
&\quad \le \frac{n}{2\pi} \sum_{1\le i<l\le d} A_{il}^1 \exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2 + u_l^2}{2(1+\rho_{il})}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

implying the validity of (38).

Since $|a^n - b^n| \le n\,|a-b|$ holds for $a, b \in [0,1]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have by (37)

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_{1:n} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{Y}_{1:n} \le \boldsymbol{u}\right)\right| &= \left|\mathbb{P}\left(\cap_{i=1}^d \cap_{j=1}^n \{X_{ij} < u_i\}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\cap_{i=1}^d \cap_{j=1}^n \{Y_{ij} < u_i\}\right)\right| \\
&= \left|\left(\mathbb{P}\left(\cap_{i=1}^d \{X_i < u_i\}\right)\right)^n - \left(\mathbb{P}\left(\cap_{i=1}^d \{Y_{ij} < u_i\}\right)\right)^n\right| \\
&\le \frac{n}{2\pi} \sum_{1\le i<l\le d} A_{il} \exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2 + u_l^2}{2(1+\rho_{il})}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

hence (39) follows and thus the proof is complete. □

Proof of Lemma 4.2: We follow the idea of the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [22]. Let $\{Z^h_{ij}, i \le d, j \le n\}$ be $N(0,1)$ random variables with covariance matrix $\Gamma^h = (\sigma^h_{ij,lk})$ where

$$\sigma^h_{ij,lk} = \mathbb{E}\left(Z^h_{ij} Z^h_{lk}\right) = \tau^h_{il} \mathbb{I}\{j = k\}, \quad i,l \le d,\ j,k \le n,\ h \in [0,1],$$

with $\tau^h_{il} := h\sigma^{(1)}_{il} + (1-h)\sigma^{(0)}_{il}$, Clearly, $\boldsymbol{Z}^h_j = \{Z^h_{ij}, i \le d\}, j \le n$ are independent and identically $N_d(0, \Sigma^h)$ distributed with $\Sigma^h = h\Sigma^1 + (1-h)\Sigma^0$. Without loss of generality, we assume that Σ^1 and Σ^0 are positive definite. Consequently, we have (see (3.4) and (3.19) in [22])

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_{n:n} < \boldsymbol{u}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{Y}_{n:n} < \boldsymbol{u}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{Z}^1_{1:n} > -\boldsymbol{u}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{Z}^0_{1:n} > -\boldsymbol{u}\right) \\
&= n \sum_{1 \le i < l \le d} (\sigma^{(1)}_{il} - \sigma^{(0)}_{il}) \int_0^1 dh \Big(\varphi(-u_i, -u_l, \tau^h_{il}) \\
&\qquad \times \mathbb{P}\left(\cap^d_{s=1, s\neq i,l} \{Z^h_{s(1)} > -u_s\} \cap^n_{t=2} \{Z^h_{it} \le -u_i, Z^h_{lt} \le -u_l\} \right), \qquad (41)
\end{aligned}$$

where $Z^h_{s(1)} = \max_{1 \le j \le n} Z^h_{sj}$, and $\varphi(-u_i, -u_l, \tau^h_{il})$ is the bivariate pdf of (Z^h_{i1}, Z^h_{l1}) which satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(-u_i, -u_l, \tau^h_{il}) &= \frac{1}{2\pi(1-(\tau^h_{il})^2)^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{u_i^2 - 2\tau^h_{il} u_i u_l + u_l^2}{2(1-(\tau^h_{il})^2)} \right) \\
&\le \frac{1}{2\pi(1-(\tau^h_{il})^2)^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{1+\rho_{il}} \right), \quad u = \min_{1 \le i \le n} u_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, let $(\tilde{Z}^h_i, \tilde{Z}^h_l)$ be a bivariate standardized normal random vector with correlation $|\tau^h_{il}|$ and set $u = \min_{1 \le i \le n} u_i > 0$. It then follows by Slepian's inequality in [24] and Lemma 2.3 in [23] that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(Z^h_{it} < -u_i, Z^h_{lt} < -u_l\right) &\le \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{Z}^h_i < -u_i, \tilde{Z}^h_l < -u_l\right) \\
&\le \mathbb{P}\left(-\tilde{Z}^h_i > u, -\tilde{Z}^h_l > u\right) \\
&\le \frac{(1+|\tau^h_{il}|)^2}{u^2} \varphi(u, u, |\tau^h_{il}|), \quad t \le n.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, with A^*_{il} defined by (40)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_{n:n} < \boldsymbol{u}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\boldsymbol{Y}_{n:n} < \boldsymbol{u}\right) \\
&\le \frac{n}{(2\pi)^n} u^{-2(n-1)} \sum_{1 \le i < l \le d} \max(\sigma^{(1)}_{il} - \sigma^{(0)}_{il}, 0) \exp\left(-\frac{nu^2}{1+\rho_{il}} \right) \int_0^1 \frac{(1+|\tau^h_{il}|)^{2(n-1)}}{(1-(\tau^h_{il})^2)^{n/2}} dh \\
&\le \frac{n}{(2\pi)^n} u^{-2(n-1)} \sum_{1 \le i < l \le d} \max(A^*_{il}, 0) \exp\left(-\frac{nu^2}{1+\rho_{il}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used the equality $\tau^h_{il} = h(\sigma^{(1)}_{il} - \sigma^{(0)}_{il}) + \sigma^{(0)}_{il}$, and thus

$$\int_0^1 \frac{(1+|\tau^h_{il}|)^{2(n-1)}}{(1-(\tau^h_{il})^2)^{n/2}} dh = \frac{1}{\sigma^{(1)}_{il} - \sigma^{(0)}_{il}} \int_{\sigma^{(0)}_{il}}^{\sigma^{(1)}_{il}} \frac{(1+|h|)^{2(n-1)}}{(1-h^2)^{n/2}} dh.$$

This completes the proof. □

Acknowledgments. Partial support from the Swiss National Science Foundation Project 200021-140633/1 and the project RARE -318984 (an FP7 Marie Curie IRSES Fellowship) is kindly acknowledged. The first author also acknowledges partial support by NCN Grant No 2013/09/B/ST1/01778 (2014-2016).

References

[1] M. Al-Rawwash and M. Seif. Measuring the surface roughness using the spatial statistics application. *J. Appl. Statist. Sci.*, 15(2, [2006 on cover]):205–213, 2007.

[2] J.M.P. Albin. On extremal theory for non differentiable stationary processes. *PhD Thesis, University of Lund, Sweden*, 1987.

[3] J.M.P. Albin. On extremal theory for stationary processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 18(1):92–128, 1990.

[4] J.M.P. Albin. Extremes and crossings for differentiable stationary processes with application to Gaussian processes in $\mathbf{R}^m$ and Hilbert space. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 42(1):119–147, 1992.

[5] J.M.P. Albin and D. Jarušková. On a test statistic for linear trend. *Extremes*, 6(3):247–258, 2003.

[6] M.T. Alodat. An approximation to cluster size distribution of two Gaussian random fields conjunction with application to FMRI data. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, 141(7):2331–2347, 2011.

[7] M.T. Alodat and M. Al-Rawwash. Skew-Gaussian random field. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 232(2):496–504, 2009.

[8] M.T. Alodat, M. Al-Rawwash, and M.A. Jebrini. Duration distribution of the conjunction of two independent F processes. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 47(1):179–190, 2010.

[9] A. Aue, L. Horváth, and M. Hušková. Extreme value theory for stochastic integrals of Legendre polynomials. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 100(5):1029–1043, 2009.

[10] S.M. Berman. Sojourns and extremes of stationary processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 10(1):1–46, 1982.

[11] S.M. Berman. *Sojourns and extremes of stochastic processes*. Wadsworth & Brooks/Cole Advanced Books & Software, Pacific Grove, CA, 1992.

[12] S. Cambanis, S. Huang, and G. Simons. On the theory of elliptically contoured distributions. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 11(3):368–385, 1981.

[13] D. Cheng and Y. Xiao. Geometry and excursion probability of multivariate Gaussian random fields. *Manuscript*, 2013.

[14] K. Dębicki, E. Hashorva, L. Ji, and K. Tabis. Asymptotic expansion for supremum of minimum of stationary Gaussian processes. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, (141–148), 2014.

[15] M. Falk, J. Hüsler, and R.-D. Reiss. Laws of small numbers: Extremes and rare events. In *DMV Seminar*, volume 23, page 3rd edn. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2010.

[16] Y. Farkas and E. Hashorva. Tail approximation for reinsurance portfolios of gaussian-like risks. *Scand. Actu. J.*, in press, 2013.

[17] A. Freitas, J. Hüsler, and M.G. Temido. Limit laws for maxima of a stationary random sequence with random sample size. *TEST*, 21(1):116–131, 2012.

[18] E. Hashorva and L. Ji. Piterbarg theorems for chi-processes with trend. *Preprint*, 2014.

[19] E. Hashorva, L. Ji, and Z. Tan. On the infinite sums of deflated Gaussian products. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 17:1–8, 2012.

[20] M.R. Leadbetter, G. Lindgren, and H. Rootzén. *Extremes and related properties of random sequences and processes*, volume 11. Springer Verlag, 1983.

[21] W.V. Li and Q.-M. Shao. A normal comparison inequality and its applications. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 122(4):494–508, 2002.

[22] D. Lu and X. Wang. Some new normal comparison inequalities related to Gordon's inequality. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, in press, 2014.

[23] J. Pickands, III. Upcrossing probabilities for stationary Gaussian processes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 145:51–73, 1969.

[24] V.I. Piterbarg. *Asymptotic methods in the theory of Gaussian processes and fields*, volume 148 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.

[25] O. Seleznjev. Asymptotic behavior of mean uniform norms for sequences of Gaussian processes and fields. *Extremes*, 8(3):161–169 (2006), 2005.

[26] Z. Tan and E. Hashorva. Exact asymptotics and limit theorems for supremum of stationary χ-processes over a random interval. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 123(8):2983–2998, 2013.

[27] Z. Tan and C. Wu. Limit laws for the maxima of stationary chi-processesunder random index. *TEST, in press*, 2014.

[28] K.J. Worsley and K.J. Friston. A test for a conjunction. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 47(2):135–140, 2000.

[29] H. Zareifard and Jafari K.M. Non-Gaussian modeling of spatial data using scale mixing of a unified skew Gaussian process. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 114:16–28, 2013.

[30] H. Zhang and A. El-Shaarawi. On spatial skew-Gaussian processes and applications. *Environmetrics*, 21(1):33–47, 2010.

Krzysztof Dębicki, Mathematical Institute, University of Wrocław, pl. Grunwaldzki 2/4, 50-384 Wrocław, Poland

E-mail address: Krzysztof.Debicki@math.uni.wroc.pl

Enkelejd Hashorva, Department of Actuarial Science, University of Lausanne,, UNIL-Dorigny, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

E-mail address: Enkelejd.Hashorva@unil.ch

Lanpeng Ji, Department of Actuarial Science, University of Lausanne, UNIL-Dorigny, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

E-mail address: Lanpeng.Ji@unil.ch

Chengxiu Ling, Department of Actuarial Science, University of Lausanne, UNIL-Dorigny, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

E-mail address: Chengxiu.Ling@unil.ch